APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,672	07/25/2003	Daisuke Sakiyama	032567-019	1827

7590   10/08/2008

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER
GARCIA, GABRIEL I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/626,672	SAKIYAMA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	GABRIEL I. GARCIA	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>6/17/08</u>.

2a)☒ This action is FINAL.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>9-24 and 27-30</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-8,25,26 and 31</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>7/25/03</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishima

(6,381,031).

Regarding claim 1 , Mishima discloses a data processing apparatus, comprising:

one or a plurality of input portions; (Fig. 6, items 9, 10 - CCD and image processor)

one or a plurality of output portions; (Fig. 6, item 200 - printer) a plurality of

compressing/expanding devices which compress data-to-be-outputted included in a job

inputted from any one of said input portions (column 5, lines 1-14 -image data is

compressed to code data) and expand the compressed data-to-be-outputted; (column

5, lines 15-23 - code data is expanded to image data and sent through the output buffer

to the printer) . It does not explicitly disclose" a job discrimination portion which

discriminates whether the job inputted from any one of said input portions is not

required to be outputted without delay; "

However, column 1, lines 14-20 - discloses that the image data read in is

compressed and stored. Then, when it is requested, the compressed data is expanded.

Also in column 5, lines 37-39, Mishima discloses that when image data are

only stored, the all the processors are set for compression. The only storing is

analogous to a job that is not required to be outputted without delay. Basically

image data of the job is stored and held until is it needed to be expanded and printed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had a decision whether a job is to be outputted without delay.

The motivation would have been to efficiently use the compression/expansion devices as Mishima is trying to do above.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to improve Mishima to obtain the invention as specified.

Mishima further discloses a controller which controls operation assignment of said plurality of compressing/expanding devices depending on a discrimination result of said job discrimination portion and activates assigned compressing/expanding devices for the job. (Column 5, lines 25-54 - the CPU is the control that sets whether each compression/expansion processor is to compress or expand depending on the amount of data to be inputted to the memory unit 13 or read out of it.)

2.   Claims 2-4, 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishima (U.S. Patent No. 6,381,031) as applied to claim 1 above, and in further view of Nomura (U.S. PG Pub. No. 2001/0048823)

Regarding claim 2, Mishima discloses a plurality of compression expansion devices for efficiently processing image data. It does not explicitly disclose the type of job and hence not "wherein said any one of output portions is a printer portion, and wherein the job not required to be outputted without delay is a store print job including a confidential print job and an initially-conduct-first-set-of-print job."

However, Nomura disclose in P[0077] that a job can be a confidential job. In P[0085] it discloses that the job can be a print test job in which a single copy is printed prior to printing all of the job. (this is what the initially-conduct-first-set-of-print job does.) Mishima and Nomura are combinable because both are in the art of forming images. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to have performed particular jobs in the Mishima invention.
The motivation would have been to improve Mishima's invention by allowing it to
process more types of jobs.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mishima and Nomura to obtain the
invention as specified.

Regarding claim 3, the secondary reference, Nomura, discloses wherein said
any one of output portions is a printer portion, and wherein the job not required to be
outputted without delay is a facsimile-receive job or an internet-facsimile- receive job to
be inputted from outside. (P[0077]) .

Regarding claim 4, Mishima discloses the data processing apparatus as recited
in claim 1, wherein, in cases where said job discrimination portion discriminates that the
job is not required to be outputted without delay, said controller changes the operation
assignment of said compressing/expanding devices so as to expedite initiation of a
subsequent job, and wherein, in cases where said job discrimination portion
discriminates that the job is required to be outputted without delay, said controller
changes the operation assignment of said compressing/expanding devices so as to
enable early outputting of the job. (column 5, lines 37-65 that compression or expansion
is set depending on how fast the data needs to be outputted. If it is just stored and held,
then all devices are set to compression. While not explicitly stated, this setting of all
devices to compression is to process the job as quickly as possible. One of ordinary
skill would realize that subsequent jobs would be processed faster or earlier because of
the setting of all devices to compression to complete a "store only" job. As the example
in lines 55-65, the CPU changes operation of the devices in order to efficiently process
and output M copies of N documents. This change in operation leads faster output of
the documents.)

Regarding claim 6, Mishima discloses the data processing apparatus as recited in claim 4, wherein, in cases where said job discrimination portion discriminates that the job is not required to be outputted without delay, said controller further changes the operation assignment of said compressing/expanding devices depending on the type of the job. (Fig. 24, and Fig. 17, $106, the assignment of the devices is dependent on the mode of the job).

3.   Claim 7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishima (U.S. Patent No. 6,381,031) as applied to claims 1 and 4 above, and further view of Motamed et al (U.S.P.G. Pub. No. 2002/0060801)

Regarding claim 7, the Mishima reference discloses a plurality of compression expansion devices for efficiently processing image data.

It does not explicitly disclose "in cases where a subsequent job is inputted from another input portion during the processing of the current job, said controller activates some of compressing/expanding devices set to be a standby state to execute compression processing of the subsequent job."

However, Motamed discloses in P[0017] that the multiple processors which are used in ripping files (i.e. compression) can perform this on one or more documents. In P[0054-0055], that jobs can be rushed through the system, and that one RIP can be used for a small job, while the rest of the RIPs can be used for a large job. While it does not explicitly state that which job is subsequent, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill that Motamed's teachings are analogous to the claimed invention because they are both able to process two differing jobs given size or time constraints.

Mishima and Motamed are combinable because both are the art of using plural compression devices for faster job processing.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to have used some resources to process an alternate job.
The motivation would have been to utilize all resources to maximize efficiency.
Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mishima and Motamed to obtain the
invention as specified.

4.   Claim 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishima
(U.S. Patent No. 6,381,031) in view of Motamed et al (U.S.P.G. Pub. No.
2002/0060801) and further in view of Nomura (U.S. PG Pub. No. 2001/0048823)

   Regarding claim 8, the Mishima reference discloses a plurality of compression
expansion devices for efficiently processing image data.

 It does not explicitly disclose "wherein, in cases where the job not required to be
outputted without delay is a confidential print job, said controller sets more
compressing/expanding devices than those required for another job not required to be
outputted without delay to be a standby state. "

   As mentioned above, the Nomura reference discloses printing confidential jobs.
Also in P[0085] and Fig. 7 of Nomura, it discloses that a confidential job can be a large
job. The Motamed reference has mentioned that more RIP processors are allocated to
large jobs in order to speed up the processing of the large jobs. Thus, the combination
of the provided information from there two references would have been obvious to one
of ordinary skill that at least large jobs which are confidential are allocated more
processing (e.g. compression) resources.

All reference are combinable because they are in the art of efficient processing of
files.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the
time of the invention to have allocated more resources to a particular type of file.
The motivation would have been to allow those particular types of files to be processed

quicker because of size or importance.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine all referencesm to obtain the invention as specified.

5.   Claims 5, 25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishima (U.S. Patent No. 6,381,031) in view of Moro (U.S. PG Pub. No. 2004/0095605)

Regarding claim 5, the Mishima reference discloses a plurality of compression expansion devices for efficiently processing image data.

It does not explicitly disclose "in cases where said discrimination portion discriminates that the job is not required to be outputted without delay, said controller assigns some of said plurality of compressing/expanding devices so as not to process the job, "

However, Moro discloses in Fig. 6 and column P[0035] that either a variable or fixed length compression/decompression or both is selected to process image data.

Hence, whether data is to be without delay, if it is just monochromatic character data, then only a variable-length compression/decompression device is needed.

Mishima and Moro are combinable because both are in the art of using combined compression/expansion devices.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have performed processing using only some of the devices.

The motivation would have been to for certain type of data to be processed more efficiently (i.e. don't need all the processing devices to process "simpler" data such as characters)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mishima and Moro to obtain the invention as specified.

Mishima further discloses wherein, in cases where said discrimination portion discriminates that the job is required to be outputted without delay, said controller

assigns all of said plurality of compressing/expanding so as to process the job. (column 5, lines 55-65).

Regarding claim 25, Mishima discloses the data processing apparatus as recited in claim 5, wherein, in cases where said job discrimination portion discriminates that the job is not required to be outputted without delay, said controller further changes the operation assignment of said compressing/expanding devices depending on the type of the job. (Fig. 24, and Fig. 17, $106, the assignment of the devices is dependent on the mode of the job)

6.   Claim 26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mishima (U.S. Patent No. 6,381,031) as applied to claims 1 and 5 above, and in further view of Moro (U.S. PG Pub. No. 2004/0095605) and in view of Motamed et al (U.S.P.G. Pub. No. 2002/0060801)

Regarding claim 26, Mishima reference discloses a plurality of compression expansion devices for efficiently processing image data.

It does not explicitly disclose "the data processing apparatus as recited in claim 5, wherein, in cases where a subsequent job is inputted from another input portion during the processing of the current job, said controller activates some of compressing/expanding devices set to be a standby state to execute compression processing of the subsequent job"

However, Motamed discloses in P[0017] that the multiple processors which are used in ripping files (i.e. compression) can perform this on one or more documents. In P[0054-0055], that jobs can be rushed through the system, and that one RIP can be used for a small job, while the rest of the RIPs can be used for a large job. While it does not explicitly state that which job is subsequent, it would be obvious to one of

ordinary skill that Motamed's teachings are analogous to the claimed invention because
they are both able to process two differing jobs given size or time constraints.

All reference are combinable because both are the art of using plural compression
devices for faster job processing.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention to have used some resources to process an alternate job.

The motivation would have been to utilize all resources to maximize efficiency.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine all references to obtain the
invention as specified.

Conclusion

7.   Applicant's arguments filed 6/17/08 have been fully considered but they are not
persuasive. With regard to applicant's argument that there is no delay in printing the
first document of the job. Examiner disagrees with Applicant's conclusion. Examiner
asserts that The only storing is analogous to a job that is not required to be outputted
without delay. Basically image data of the job is stored and held until is it needed to be
expanded and printed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in
the art at the time of the invention to have had a decision whether a job is to be
outputted without delay. Also fig. 6, depicts and suggests how the data stored in
memory 505 can be processed directly to the printer without delay. Fig. 15 confirm that
print data can be printed without delay.

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time
policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Gabriel I. Garcia whose telephone number is 571-272-

7434. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (571)272-7402. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gabriel I Garcia/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2625

Gabriel I. Garcia

Primary Examiner

September 29, 2008

1. Claims 24-28, 30-39, and 41-47 are still rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being , as applied to claims 1 and 4 abov

anticipated by Vidyanand (6,967,728).

   With regard to claim 24, Vidyanand teaches a method of previewing (see figs. 5-10

and col. 7, lines 61-67) a document, comprising: selecting a print driver (e.g. figs. 5-8,

and col. 7, lines 32-44) (any client of fig. 1); generating a print file based on the

document using the selected print driver (e.g. fig. 8, and col. 7, lines 32-44);

transmitting the print file to a server over a network (see figs. 2,4 and 15 and col. 5,

lines 45-64); receiving image data on the client over the network, the image data being

based on the transmitted print file (e.g. col. 5, lines 24-64 and col. 8, line 59 thru col. 9,

line 52) ; and displaying the image data in an interface at the client based on the

transmitted print file (e.g. reads on figs. 5-10, and col. 7, lines 61-67).

With regard to claim 25, Vidyanand further teaches wherein the selecting step

includes: displaying a list of print drivers on the client; and choosing a desired print

driver (e.g. figs. 5-8, and col. 7, lines 32-44).

With regard to claim 26, Vidyanand further teaches obtaining the print driver

(e.g. figs. 5-8, and col. 7, lines 32-44, and fig. 8, and col. 7, lines 32-44).

With regard to claim 27, Vidyanand further teaches obtaining step includes

transmitting the print driver to the client over the network (reads on fig. 1-10) .

With regard to claim 28, Vidyanand further teaches creating the document using an

application installed on the client (e.g. fig. 8).

With regard to claim 30, Vidyanand further teaches verifying the print driver before

the transmitting step (e.g. figs. 5-8, and col. 7, lines 32-44, and fig. 8, and col. 7, lines

32-44).

With regard to claim 31, Vidyanand further teaches selecting file information

associated with the print file using the interface (e.g. figs. 1-8).

With regard to claim 32, the limitations of claim 32 are covered by the limitations of

claim 24 above; and Vidyanand further teaches the upload manager (reads on fig. 9 for

transmitting the print file (e.g. col. 7, lines 32-44, and fig. 8, and col. 7, lines 32-44).

With regard to claim 33, Vidyanand further teaches a version manager for verifying

the print driver before transmitting the print file ((e.g. figs. 5-8, and col. 7, lines 32-44,

and fig. 8, and col. 7, lines 32-44).

With regard to claim 34, Vidyanand further teaches an application for creating the document, wherein the application is installed on the client (reads on figs 1-10).

With regard to claim 35, Vidyanand further teaches a wide area network, and the Internet (e.g. fig. 3).

With regard to computer program claims 36-39 and 41-42, the steps of the computer claims 36-39 and 41-42 read on the steps of the method claims 24,25,27-31 are describe above. The method steps of claims 24,25 and 27-31 can be program and store in the memory (208,209 or 232) of Vidyanand to create computer programs of claims 36-39 and 41-42.

With regard to claim 43, Vidyanand further teaches wherein the print file comprises a postscript file (see col. 9, lines 53-67).

With regard to claims 44-46, Vidyanand further teaches selecting a finishing option (e.g. binding) for the document, wherein the image data is further based on the selected finishing option (reads on fig. 9).

With regard to claim 47, the limitations of claim 47 are covered by the limitations of claim 43 above.

With regard to claim 48, Vidyanand further teaches generating is performed without selecting a printer (e.g. fig. 8, and col. 7, lines 32-44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 29 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vidyanand (6,967,728).as applied to claims 24 and/or 32 above, and further in view of Grohs et al. (2001/0043753).

With regard to claim 29, Vidyanand teaches the communication of data between the

client and printer (see fig. 1), but fails to explicitly teach compressing the print file before

transmitting step. However, Grohs et al. (in the same field of endeavor "data processing" teaches that it is well known in the art to

compress the print file before transmitting it [0032]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

provide the system of Vidyanand with the ability of compressing the data as taught by Grohs et al. because of the following

reasons; 1) as suggested by Grohs et al. in paragraph [0032]. To reduce time and resources, and 2) to allow the system of Cooper

et al. to send the data a lot faster by compressing large files before transmitting them.

With regard to computer program claim 40, the steps of the computer

Claim 40 read on the steps of the method claim 29 above. The method steps of claims

40 can be program and store in the memory (208,209 or 232) of Vidyanand to create

computer programs of claims 40.

Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** *Applicant is reminded of the extension of time*

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of

this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from

the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS

from the mailing date of this final action.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to pending claims have been considered but

arguments are not found to be persuasive. With regard to Applicant's argument that

Vidyanand does not teach generating a print file based on a document using a selected

driver. Examiner assets that Vidyanand teaches generating a print file based on a

document using a selected driver (e.g. fig. 8, and col. 7, lines 32-44). Clearly fig. 8
depicts how a user can generate a file by creating a new file and by applying the print
driver to the application creating the file as describe in col. 7, lines 32-44;, the user can
prepare the file that can be understood by a printer and it can be preview before it is
send to the printer (see fig. 9 depicts how the file to be send to the printer is
preview before it is send to the printer. Else the file to be printed has to be converted to
setting (or print .driver) so that the print file can be understood by the printer.

   With regard to Applicant's argument that Vidyanand does not teach transmitting the
print file to a server over a network. Examiner disagrees with Applicant's conclusion.
Examiner asserts that .Vidyanand teaches transmitting the print file to a server over a
Network (see figs. 2,4 and 15 and col. 5, lines 45-64). Clearly figs 2,4 and 15, depict
how a user can generate a print job using a selected print driver or printer at the host
computer 12a and send the print file to a server for storage or printing. Col. 5, lines 45-
64 describe how the host computer creates the print job by using the print preference
that allow the user to send the file to a network printer thru a server as depicted in figs
2,4 and 15.

   With regard to Applicant's argument that Vidyanand does not teach receiving image
data on the client over the network, the image data being based on the transmitted print
file. Examiner disagrees with Applicant's conclusion. Examiner asserts that .Vidyanand
teaches receiving image data on the client over the network, the image data being
based on the transmitted print file (e.g. col. 5, lines 24-64 and col. 8, line 59 thru col. 9,
line 52). Clearly col. 5, 24-64 describe how data can be send to a client over the
network from a server or storage or other clients.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Gabriel I. Garcia whose telephone number is (571) 272-
7434. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 7:30 AM-6:00
PM. The fax phone number for this group is (571) 273-8300.
If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Edward L. Coles can be reached on (571) 272-7402. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist

whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

/Gabriel I Garcia/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2625

Gabriel I. Garcia
Primary Examiner
September 296, 2008